

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/642,896	Applicant(s) TAKANO ET AL.	
	Examiner Frank Duong	Art Unit 2616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Frank Duong. (3) _____
 (2) Brian Hennessey (Reg. No. 51271). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 December 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant calls and inquires why the Office requires a certified English translation for the submitted priority paper and also points out that the claimed priority was not recognized in the PTOL-37 dated 11/06/07. Examiner explains that the Applicants cannot rely upon the filing date of the priority paper to overcome a 35 U.S.C., paragraph 102(e) rejection without the corresponding certified English translation. The claimed priority for the instant application had been acknowledge in the Office Action dated 05/22/07 in the priority section. However, due to an over sighted reason, the priority box in the PTOL-326 was not checked. Due to such action, this supplemental action serves as a secondary acknowledgement that the claimed priority has been considered and as a response to the Applicants' inquiry .